



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,471	07/17/2002	Jeffrey Rahn	107153	7900
27074	7590	03/02/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			HO, ALLEN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CT

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/064,471	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAHN, JEFFREY	
	<b>Examiner</b> Allen C. Ho	<b>Art Unit</b> 2882	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: The last two sentences seem to recite the same limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fossum *et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 5,841,126).

With regard to claim 1, Fossum *et al.* disclosed an imaging system, comprising: an input device (300) that includes a pixel device (Fig. 1) which further includes a sensor (100) that provides an electronic signal that represents an image, at least one transistor (106) connected to the sensor; and a controller (302), the electronic signal provided by the sensor and controlled by the controller so that the electronic signal is either stored in a first capacitor (114), or is stored in a second capacitor (118).

However, Fossum *et al.* failed to teach that the imaging system further comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, and the electronic signal representing an image is provided to the two-dimensional array of pixels.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an output device (*e. g.*, a display) that comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, since a person would be motivated to view the image detected by the imaging system.

With regard to claim 2, Fossum *et al.* disclosed the imaging system according to claim 1, the pixel device further comprising: a plurality of transistors (116, 120) and at least two control signals, one of the at least two control signals controlling one of the plurality of transistors so that the electronic signal is stored in the first capacitor (column 3, lines 9-11), and the other one of the at least two control signals controlling another one of the plurality of transistors so that the electronic signal is stored in the second capacitor (column 3, lines 16-17).

With regard to claim 3, Fossum *et al.* disclosed the imaging system of claim 2, wherein the first capacitor is independently active for greater than 10 microseconds. This claim fails to set forth additional structural limitation. Accordingly, it is rejected with claim 2.

With regard to claim 18, Fossum *et al.* disclosed an imaging system, comprising: an input device (300) that includes a pixel device (Fig. 1) which further includes a sensor (100) that provides an electronic signal that represents an image, at least one transistor (106) connected to the sensor; and a controller (302) that stores the electronic signal that represents the image in a first capacitor (114) or stores the electronic signal that represents the image in a second capacitor (118).

However, Fossum *et al.* failed to teach that the imaging system further comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, and the electronic signal representing an image is provided to the two-dimensional array of pixels.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an output device (*e. g.*, a display) that comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, since a person would be motivated to view the image detected by the imaging system.

4. Claims 1-3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Böhm *et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 6,518,558 B1).

With regard to claim 1, Böhm *et al.* disclosed an imaging system, comprising: an input device that includes a pixel device (04) which further includes a sensor (01) that provides an electronic signal that represents an image, at least one transistor (07, 11, 15) connected to the sensor; and a controller (100), the electronic signal provided by the sensor and controlled by the controller so that the electronic signal is either stored in a first capacitor (08), or is stored in a second capacitor (12, 16). Note: although not explicitly stated, the switches would have to be transistors in an integrated circuit.

However, Böhm *et al.* failed to teach that the imaging system further comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, and the electronic signal representing an image is provided to the two-dimensional array of pixels.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an output device (*e. g.*, a display) that comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, since a person would be motivated to view the image detected by the imaging system.

With regard to claim 2, Böhm *et al.* disclosed the imaging system according to claim 1, the pixel device further comprising: a plurality of transistors (07, 11, 15) and at least two control

signals, one (06) of the at least two control signals controlling one of the plurality of transistors so that the electronic signal is stored in the first capacitor, and the other one (10, 14) of the at least two control signals controlling another one of the plurality of transistors so that the electronic signal is stored in the second capacitor.

With regard to claim 3, Böhm *et al.* disclosed the imaging system of claim 2, wherein the first capacitor is independently active for greater than 10 microseconds. This claim fails to set forth additional structural limitation. Accordingly, it is rejected with claim 2.

With regard to claim 18, Böhm *et al.* disclosed an imaging system, comprising: an input device that includes a pixel device (04) which further includes a sensor (01) that provides an electronic signal that represents an image, at least one transistor (07, 11, 15) connected to the sensor; and a controller (100) that stores the electronic signal that represents the image in a first capacitor (08) or stores the electronic signal that represents the image in a second capacitor (12, 16).

However, Böhm *et al.* failed to teach that the imaging system further comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, and the electronic signal representing an image is provided to the two-dimensional array of pixels.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an output device (*e. g.*, a display) that comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels, since a person would be motivated to view the image detected by the imaging system.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 07 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Fossum *et al.* failed to disclose "the electronic signal provided by the sensor and controlled by the controller so that the electronic signal is either stored in a first capacitor, or is stored in a second capacitor," as recited in claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fossum *et al.* disclosed two capacitors and a controller that stores the electronic signal in one of the capacitors, which reads on the limitation "the electronic signal is either stored in a first capacitor, or is stored in a second capacitor". The examiner agrees with the applicant that Fossum *et al.* failed to disclose a controller that selectively stores the electronic signal in either a first capacitor or a second capacitor. However, this is not being claimed in claim 1. Claim 1 simply claims that the electronic signal is stored in one of the capacitors. The logic operator or means that the statement is true if one of the conditions is satisfied.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Chen *et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 5,901,257) disclosed a color MOS image sensor comprising four capacitors for selectively storing image signals.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen C. Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-2491. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2882

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward J. Glick can be reached at (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Allen C. Ho  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2882

25 February 2005